

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. Would it be acceptable for another network to preempt regular programming and to air Micheal Moore's "Fahrenheit 9/11"?

Too much \$\$\$ is changing hands for advertising in this election already! Does this really serve anyone other than the fat cats at the networks?

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.